

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1, 4, 7, 11 and 15-23 are pending in the above-identified application. Claim 2-3, 5-6, 8-10 and 12-14 are cancelled. New claims 16-23 have been added.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Jenson and Frelechoux et al. The rejection of claims 5-6, 8-10 and 12-14 are moot due to the cancellation of these claims. Claim 1 is amended to include the features of claims 2 and 9, namely,

... requesting, by a second router device, the information  
**when the second router device detects a connection to  
the local area network ...**

... the first router device sends the information to the second  
router device based on the request by the second router.  
(Emphasis added).

Applicants' exemplary embodiment includes a master router device 101 and router device 103. In order to "newly connect" to the network, router device 103 transmits a virtual router information solicitation message 150. (Page 15, lines 10-13). For example, router device 103 may "newly connect" when connection to the network completes in layer 3. (Page 15, line 25). That is, Applicants' exemplary embodiment discloses "...requesting, by a second router device, the information **when the second router device detects a connection to the local area network,**" as recited in claim 1. In response, master router device 101 sends information which is required for the virtual router process. (Page 15, lines 14-17). That is, Applicants' exemplary embodiment discloses "...the first router device sends the information to the second router device based on the request by the second router."

The Examiner argues that Jenson discloses the features of original claim 9. In particular, the Examiner argues that Jenson discloses a VRRP router "...configured to run the VRRP in conjunction with one or more other routers attached to a network..." (Office Action, page 7, lines 7-12). Jenson discloses, however, the configuration of conventional VRRP. That is, Jenson discloses that the router can run VRRP with other routers which are already attached to the network. (Para. [0009]). Thus, Jenson does not disclose "...requesting, by a second router device, the information **when the second router device detects a connection to the local area network,**" as recited in claim 1. Frelechoux et al. also does not disclose these features.

Applicants' claimed features may be advantageous over the prior art because the second router device, when newly connecting to the network, can dynamically acquire virtual router information from the existing router system and set with data required for its own virtual router processing. This can automatically make a virtual router setting in a brief time, thus relieving the load of the manager (operator) and reducing communication loss. (Page 24, line 8-14).

Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 4 is also allowable over the art of record.

Claim 7, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 7 is also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claims 11 and 15 depend from claim 7. Accordingly, claims 11 and 15 are also allowable over the art of record.

New claims 16-23 have been added. Basis for new claims 16-19 may be found, for example, in the specification, at page 14, line 22 to page 15, line 9. Basis for new claims 20-23 may be found, for example, in the specification, at page 13, line 23 to page 14, line 2. No new matter has been added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515  
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/DDF/dmw

Dated: December 18, 2007

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

209924